ΑD	1		

Award Number: DAMD17-03-1-0553

TITLE: Long Term Outcomes of BRCA1/BRCA2 Mutation Testing

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marc D. Schwartz, Ph.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: Georgetown University

Washington, DC 20007

REPORT DATE: August 2007

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command

Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for Public Release; **Distribution Unlimited**

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

REPORT DO	CUMENTATIO	N PAGE		Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is e data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headqu 4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN Y	of information. Send comments regar arters Services, Directorate for Infor any other provision of law, no persor	rding this burden estimate or any mation Operations and Reports (a shall be subject to any penalty f	y other aspect of this co (0704-0188), 1215 Jeffe	llection of information, including suggestions for reducing rson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-
1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE		-	ATES COVERED
20-08-2007 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	Annual			JUL 2006- 20 JUL 2007 CONTRACT NUMBER
Long Term Outcomes of BRCA1/BF	RCA2 Mutation Testing	g	54. \	SONTRACT NOMBER
				GRANT NUMBER
				MD17-03-1-0553
			5C.	PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S) Marc D. Schwartz, Ph.D.			5d.	PROJECT NUMBER
			5e. ·	TASK NUMBER
			Ef 1	VORK UNIT NUMBER
Email: schwartm@georgetown.edu			5f. V	VORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. P	ERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT
Commenter of Heisters in			N	UMBER
Georgetown University Washington, DC 20007				
Washington, DC 20007				
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY		S(ES)	10.	SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
U.S. Army Medical Research and M Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012				
Tort Detrick, Maryland 21702 3012			11.	SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT
			1	NUMBER(S)
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATE Approved for Public Release; Distrib				
Approved for Fubilic Release, Distrik	Jation Onlinnited			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT				
This project aims to gain a better under				
goal is to evaluate the impact of BRCA1 prevention/surveillance (mammography				
chemoprevention) outcomes. To accom				
test results at least four years ago. We	will divide our sample ba	sed upon their person	nal cancer histor	y – evaluating cancer survivors with
different measures compared to unaffect				
samples of women who have never recaccrual. We have initiated accrual and t				
continue accrual of our genetic testing of				annig me apeeming year ne min
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
BRCA1, BRCA2, Outcomes				<u>, </u>
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON USAMRMC
a. REPORT b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area

UU

U

U

code)

9

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	4-5
Body	6-7
Key Research Accomplishments	7
Reportable Outcomes	7-8
Conclusions	8
References	N/A
Appendices	9

INTRODUCTION

Genetic testing for breast-ovarian cancer susceptibility has the potential to reduce breast and ovarian cancer mortality among high risk women. However, there has been ongoing concern regarding the quality of life implications of learning one's mutation status. To date, there have been no studies to evaluate the long-term psychosocial and behavioral impact of receiving clinical BRCA1/2 test results. Several studies have examined these outcomes in the short-term. Although preliminary evidence suggests that the receipt of a positive BRCA1/2 test result does not lead to increased short-term distress, it is clear that women who receive positive test results do report more distress than those who receive negative test results. It is not clear, however, whether this distress has long-term implications. It is possible that distress could decline over time as the individual adapts to her positive test result and ongoing risk. Alternatively, the modestly elevated distress reported in the short-term could be evidence of chronic stress. Ongoing stress has been shown to adversely impact health behaviors and health outcomes. Given the risk status of this population, it is particularly important to better understand the long-term distress levels and the role of distress in adoption of recommended breast and ovarian cancer risk reduction and early detection behavior. To date, there have been no studies to examine these issues.

One of the main potential benefits of BRCA1/BRCA2 testing is to motivate carriers to take behavioral action to reduce their risk of breast and ovarian cancer mortality. However, we do not yet know whether carriers actually engage in such actions. Preliminary evidence suggests that a relatively small proportion of carriers obtain prophylactic surgery in the year following testing. The proportion of carriers who utilize chemopreventive agents such as tamoxifen remains unknown. The few studies to examine screening utilization in the year following disclosure found sub-optimal rates of screening among positives. In fact, rates of mammography have not been found to increase following a positive mutation test. Although mutation carriers did report higher rates of mammography, this difference was due to appropriate decreases in screening among younger noncarriers. In terms of ovarian cancer screening, rates of CA-125 and transvaginal ultrasound do increase among carriers in the year following testing. However, overall ovarian cancer screening rates remain below 30%. To date, there have been no studies to evaluate the long-term cancer prevention and screening behaviors of this population. If genetic testing is to fulfill its promise of reducing mortality among individuals from hereditary cancer families, behavioral change must follow the receipt of a positive test result. The first step to addressing this question is to evaluate the behavior of individuals in the years following testing. If individuals remain non-adherent to prevention and screening guidelines, it is particularly important to understand why and to identify early predictors of behavioral non-adherence in this vulnerable population. We will evaluate the role of distress/quality of life as a potential predictor of adverse behavioral outcomes.

The primary goal of this project is to evaluate long term psychosocial (quality of life, distress, social functioning) and prevention/surveillance (mammography, CA125, transvaginal ultrasound, prophylactic mastectomy, prophylactic oophorectomy and chemoprevention) outcomes. To accomplish this we will measure outcomes within a group of women who received BRCA1/BRCA2 test results at least four years ago. We will divide our sample based upon their personal cancer history – evaluating cancer survivors with different measures compared to unaffected individuals. For both survivors and unaffected individuals we will recruit separate comparison samples of women who have never received BRCA1/BRCA2 testing.

Until we better understand the long-term outcomes of BRCA1/2 testing, it is unlikely that such testing will fulfill its promise to reduce breast and ovarian cancer mortality. By evaluating the impact of

testing, appropriate intervention strategies can be developed so that individuals at-risk for distress or non-adherence could be targeted for early intervention and/or ongoing support. This research could provide information necessary to make decisions about how and where to allocate scarce counseling resources and to tailor health promotion efforts to individual needs. Genetic testing for breast-ovarian cancer susceptibility is becoming more widely available to the general population. Prior to its routine use, we should make sure that we fully understand its long-term implications.

BODY

We have listed each of the tasks from our Statement of Work, and the associated accomplishments.

Task 1. Finalize accrual procedures and measures to be included (months 1-6).

a. Meet with CARE program staff to confirm the procedures for patient recontact.

We completed this task during year 1.

b. Finalize recruitment letters for each of the study cohorts.

These letters were completed during year 1 and were included with the Year 1 Annual Report.

c. Finalize the telephone questionnaires to be administered to each cohort.

These interviews were completed during Year 1, were approved by the DOD IRB, and were included in the Year 1 Annual Report.

d. Develop interview database.

The study database was completed during Year 1, tested in Years 1 and 2, and became fully operational during Year 2. We are now using the database for all data entry and participant tracking. During Year 4 we will make slight modifications to the database to accommodate accrual of comparison participants.

e. Develop subject tracking system using Access database.

The tracking system has been developed and is currently being utilized for participant tracking.

f. Review computer databases of each cohort to determine procedures for participants recruitment and eligibility.

Done.

Task 2. Conduct participant accrual (months 4-48).

Participant accrual is ongoing. To date, we completed 370 interviews with former CARE participants. Thus far, just over 70% of eligible women have completed an interview. In addition to the 370 interviews that have been completed, we currently have 24 interviews scheduled and in September will contact a new group of at least 150 CARE participants. Thus, during our no-cost extension year, we expect to reach a total of at least 500 completed cohort interviews.

During Year 4, we also continued comparison group accrual. We will continue to focus on comparison group accrual during the no-cost extension year. To date we have completed or scheduled 151 comparison group interviews. We expect to complete our comparison group enrollment during the no-cost extension year.

With the no-cost extension, we expect to reach our projected sample sizes. With nearly 400 completed and scheduled cohort interviews, we are close to reaching our proposed cohort sample of 500.

Tasks 3 and 4. Preliminary Data Analyses and manuscript preparation (months 24-48)

We had originally proposed to begin preliminary data analyses at the start of Year 3. However, due to initial delays in approval of the protocol, we have had to delay preliminary analysis of data. Preliminary data analysis has begun on two research questions. First, we examined the communication of genetic test results among individuals who underwent BRCA1/2 testing. Specifically, analyzed the association between communication with family members and long-term quality of life outcomes. We have submitted a manuscript based upon these results (Tercyak, K.P., Graves, K.D., Peshkin, B.N., Schwartz, M.D. Long-term follow-up of women's decisions to share *BRCA1/2* test results with first-degree relatives. <u>Under Review</u>). We are also in the process of writing a manuscript based upon our data related to menopausal symptoms among women who underwent BRCA1/2 testing. We expect this manuscript to be submitted in the Fall of 2007. During the no-cost extension year we will conduct additional analyses related to our key study outcomes – and expect to publish at least three additional manuscripts

KEY RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Our accomplishments to date include:

- enrolling and completing interviews with over 400 participants
- submitting our first manuscript based upon data from this project

REPORTABLE OUTCOMES

To date we have submitted one manuscript focused on familial communication of genetic test results. This manuscript was submitted to *Psychoonology*.

Data for this manuscript were based on 274 women who had completed an interview by the time of data analysis for this paper. Demographic characteristics of the women who participated are as follows: M(SD) age = 54.1 (9.6) years, 91.1% Caucasian, 96.4% college-educated, and 70.2% lived in households with a family income \geq \$75k. The M(SD) calendar time that had elapsed since testing averaged 5.3 (1.2) years.

Table 1. Family Structure and Closeness Ratings			
Relative Category	N	%	M (SD) closeness
Parents	158	57.7	
Mothers	126	46.0	3.8 (0.5)
Fathers	116	42.3	3.6 (0.8)
Siblings	238	86.9	
Sisters	173	63.1	3.7 (0.7)
Brothers	139	50.7	3.4 (0.9)
Spouses	214	78.1	3.9 (0.5)
Children	185	68.9	
<u><</u> 18	55	29.7	3.8 (0.3)
< 18	130	70.3	3.9 (0.5)

Data regarding women's family structure are presented in Table 1. As shown, more than one-half of women were able to report on family communication to parents, over three-quarters reported on communication to siblings and spouses, and slightly more than two-thirds reported on communication to children.

When family communication was analyzed via disclosure (Yes/No) to relatives, rates of communication to adult relatives was consistently high: 94.4% reported disclosing their *BRCA1/2* test results to their mothers, 87.1% to their fathers, 96.5% to their sisters, 84.2% to their brothers, 98.1% to

their spouses, and 95.3% to their children over the age of 18; disclosure was less common to children under the age of 18 (53.6%).

To examine the potential impact of test results (i.e., carriers vs. uninformatives) on disclosure patterns to relatives, the association between these variables was tested via Chi-square statistics. There were no significant differences in rates of disclosure between carriers and uninformatives to all relatives except for brothers; carriers were more likely to disclose their test results to their brothers than were uninformatives, X^2 (1) = 8.14, p = .004.

Table 2. Association of closeness with disclosure			
Relatives	r_{pb}	$sr_y(1.2)$	
Mothers	.25*	.25*	
Fathers	.28*	.30*	
Sisters	.16*	.16*	
Brothers	.40*	.39*	
Spouses	.20*	.21*	
Children ≥ 18	.25*	.25*	
Children < 18	09	10	

Note. r_{pb} denotes point-biserial correlation between closeness and disclosure; $s_{ry(1.2)}$ denotes semi-partial correlation between closeness and disclosure, controlling for test results.

Finally, the potential association between kinship and disclosure was examined via point-biserial correlations, with and without the potential impact of test results partialled out. These results, shown in Table 2, consistently indicate that women who reported stronger kinship ties and closer relationships with their adult relatives during the time they underwent *BRCA1/2* testing were more likely to inform those relatives of their results. The strength of these associations remained largely unchanged when genetic test results were accounted for. For children under the age of 18 years, closeness was not associated with disclosure.

CONCLUSIONS

This project seeks to gain a better understanding of the long-term psychosocial and behavioral implications of undergoing genetic counseling and testing for breast-ovarian cancer susceptibility. Since the start of the study, we have prepared all of our data collection and data management tools, hired our study staff, begun regular meetings, and compiled lists of participants to be contacted for participation. However, due to delays on the part of the Department of Defense Human Subjects review, we have been unable to commence study accrual and interviewing. After receiving final DOD approval, we initiated accrual and have been completing interviews at the expected pace.

REFERENCES

None

APPENDIX A: Current Salaried Study Personnel

Marc D. Schwartz, Ph.D.

Beth N. Peshkin, M.S.

Kathryn L. Taylor, Ph.D.

Claudine Isaacs, M.D.

Kristi Graves, Ph.D.

Christy Gell, M.S.

Sharon Hecker

Principal Investigator

Co-Investigator

Co-Investigator

Project Director

Data Specialist

Research Assistant